

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-29 and 33 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 25, 28 and 29 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of Reply. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the telephone conversation of February 15, 2008. The below noted comments present in greater detail distinctive points of the claimed subject matter that were submitted to the Examiner over the telephone.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 4-11, 14-22, 25, 27-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 4-11, 14-22, 25, 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer (US Pub 2003/0084429), in view of Dewhurst *et al.* (US 6,430,609). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Schaefer and Dewhurst fail to teach or suggest all aspects of subject claims.

Applicants' claimed invention relates to system and methodology to facilitate navigation for inexperienced and experienced programmers to create user interface automation and to facilitate a modular system which can be modified without recompilation of the executables. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component based, at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store and information stored in a command information store, the navigation component further modifies the user interface automation without recompiling executables by modifying the map information store and/or the command information store, the navigation component further employs a global information store and facilitates a global variable replacement from a single location and sharing of a common program flow among a plurality of users.* Also independent claim 22 recites *modifying the user interface automation without recompilation of executables by storing data, commands and executables separately.* Schaefer and Dewhurst neither teaches nor suggests such novel aspects.

Scharefer provides systems and methods for table driven automation testing for performing functional testing of a software program. The system includes a GUI translator component to translate one or more GUI maps into a set of database tables, a data input component to facilitate entry and editing of test case data in the tables, and a test engine component for executing the software program based on a test case stored in the tables; and Scharefer fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. The Examiner acknowledges that the primary reference, Scharefer does not teach the claimed invention and provides a secondary reference, Dewhurst, to compensate for the after mentioned deficiencies of Scharefer. The secondary reference, Dewhurst, given by Examiner, relates to a method for accessing complex software applications through a client user interface. The method includes accessing a master configuration file containing an array of configuration variables controlling the execution of software application, pre-selecting a subset of configuration variables from the array of configuration variables contained in the master configuration file, generating the client user interface to modify only the subset of configuration variables and transmitting the client user interface to client computer; and this reference does not teach the claimed invention.

At page 9 of Office Action, Examiner incorrectly contends that Dewhurst teaches *modifying the user interface automation without recompilation of executables by storing data, commands and executables separately*, with respect to independent claim 22. The cited portion of the reference (Dewhurst) provides for a method for configuring and executing a software application with a client user interface. The method includes accessing a master configuration file containing an array of configuration variables controlling the execution of software application, pre-selecting a subset of configuration variables from the array of configuration variables contained in the master configuration file, generating the client user interface to modify only the subset of configuration variables, transmitting the client user interface to a client computer, receiving the subset of configuration variables as modified on the client computer, applying the subset of configuration variables against the master configuration file, executing the software application in accordance with the master configuration file on a computational server, the execution of software application producing an output result, and transmitting the output result to the client computer (Col. 4, lines 33-65). Hence Dewhurst provides for

only executing a software application with a client user interface wherein a subset of configuration variables in a master configuration file are pre-selected to generate a client user interface to modify only the subset of configuration variables and executing the software application in accordance with the master file, the subset of configuration variables applied against the master file, and generating and transmitting output result to the client computer. Hence the whole software application, in accordance with the modified master file due to applied subset of configuration variables to the master file, is executed. However Dewhurst does not contemplate *storing data, commands and executables separately and modifying the user interface automation without recompilation of executables*. Through this feature, the claimed subject matter facilitates a modular system which can be modified quickly and efficiently without recompilation of the executables. The claimed subject matter mitigates recompilation of executables as information (e.g., data and/or command(s)) associated with program flow are generally stored in simple text files separately than executables thus reducing the need to recompile the executables. Thus, modification of these text files produces new behavior for the executables. Hence update to the program flow only requires a modification to these text files and not the executables or engine.

In addition, at page 3 of Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly contends that Scharefer teaches *a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component*. The cited portion of reference (Scharefer) provides for a test engine component which queries the tables to retrieve data for a test case and use one or more GUI maps along with the data for test case to call a function in the software controller. The software controller component receives instructions and data from the test engine component and transmits instructions and data to the software program thereby controlling the execution of software program (see, Paragraph [0038]). The memory includes a graphical user interface translator component, a data input component, a test engine component, a software controller component and an operating system. The GUI translator component translates one or more GUI maps into a set of database tables and a data input component facilitates creation of one or more test cases, which are input as data into the tables by the data input component (see, Paragraph [0041]). Test engine component uses the contents of GUI map stored in memory to

determine which software controller component function to call to process the objects on the window that are described by the GUI map and also monitors results, received from the software controller about the execution of the software program (see, Paragraphs [0054] & [0055]). Hence Scharefer provides for table driven automation testing of a software program by translating one or more GUI maps into a set of database tables by a GUI translator component and then querying the tables to retrieve data for a test, and nowhere teaches or suggests *a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component*. Examiner erroneously considers the test engine component provided by Scharefer same as navigation component, as provided in the claimed subject matter. The test engine component of Scharefer provides for querying the tables to retrieve data for a test case and use one or more GUI maps along with the data for test case to call a function in the software controller and providing instructions and data to the software controller component. However claimed subject matter provides a navigation component that *facilitates simulated user interface* and helps inexperienced programmers to create window type automation. *Navigation component* and *simulated user interface* facilitate the user to create UI automation without any substantial knowledge of functionality associated with the system and mitigates creation time.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is clear that Scharefer and Dewhurst fail to teach each and every aspect recited in independent claim 1, 22, 25, 28 and 29. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection of independent claims 1, 22, 25, 28 and 29 (and the claims that depend) be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Dewhurst in further view of Minard (US Patent 6,247,020). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scharefer, Dewhurst and Minard either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Minard relates to development system with application browser user interface and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Scharefer and Dewhurst with respect to independent claim 1 (from which

claim 2 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 2 is not obvious over the combination of Scharefer, Dewhurst and Minard. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 12-13, 23 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12-13, 23 and 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Dewhurst in further view of Zimmniewicz *et al.* (US Patent 6,744,450). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scharefer, Dewhurst and Zimmniewicz either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Zimmniewicz relates to system and method for providing multiple installation actions and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Scharefer and Dewhurst with respect to independent claims 1 (from which claim 12 and 13 depend), 22 (from which claim 23 depends) and independent claim 25 (from which claim 26 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 is not obvious over the combination of Scharefer, Dewhurst and Zimmniewicz. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731